

**REMARKS**

I. **Summary of Office Action**

Claims 1-13 were examined and claims 14-17 are newly added herein. Consequently, claims 1-17 are pending in the above-identified patent application. The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorge et al. European Patent Publication No. EP 8678 ("Gorge") in view of Beck U.S. Patent No. 6,276,761 ("Beck").

II. **Summary of the Reply**

Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 4-5 and 8-9 to more particularly define the claimed invention. Applicants have also added new claims 14-17. The claim amendments and new claims are fully supported by the originally-filed application and therefore do not add new matter.

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

III. **Applicant's Reply to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gorge in view of Beck

Applicants' claimed invention, as defined by independent claims 1 and 5, is directed to a method and a system for refilling service-brake circuits in a vehicle compressed air system. The vehicle compressed air system includes, among other things, service-brake circuits, at least one additional compressed air consumer circuit, and an air compressor. Pneumatic communication is established between intact ones of the service-brake circuits and the at least one additional compressed air consumer circuits while "said intact of said service-brake circuits are also in pneumatic communication with [the] air compressor."

Gorge and Beck, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to show or suggest all features of applicants' claimed invention. In particular, Gorge and Beck fail to show or suggest that the intact ones of the service-brake circuits are in pneumatic communication with at

least one additional compressed air consumer circuit and also in pneumatic communication with an air compressor of the vehicle compressed air system, as required by applicants' independent claims 1 and 5. In direct contrast, Gorge and Beck both require that the service-brake circuits can only be in pneumatic communication with either another compressed air circuit or with an air compressor. For example, Gorge teaches that valve 7 is only opened (i.e., to couple compressed air reservoirs 1a, 1b, and/or 1c to high pressure accumulator 9) when "air compressor 4 does not work" (*see, e.g.*, Gorge, paragraph 11). Thus, Gorge directly teaches against pneumatically coupling compressed air reservoirs 1a, 1b, and/or 1c to high pressure accumulator 9 and to air compressor 4 at the same time. As another example, Beck teaches that "alternatively" to using the compressor 11 to supply air, high pressure circuit 30 can be coupled to the other air consumer circuits "rather than plac[ing] the compressor on load." (*see, e.g.*, Beck, column 5, lines 14-22). Thus, in the same manner, Beck also directly teaches against pneumatically coupling the air consumer circuits (e.g., such as service-brake circuits 2.1 and 2.2) to both high pressure circuit 30 and compressor 11 at the same time.

For at least the above-mentioned reason, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 5, and any claims depending therefrom, including claims 2-4 and 6-17, are allowable over Gorge and Beck, whether taken alone or in combination. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-13 be withdrawn.

#### IV. Applicants' New Claims 14-17

Applicants have added new dependent claims 14-17. These new claims are fully supported by applicants' originally-filed application and no new subject matter has been added.

New claims 14-17 each depend from independent base claim 1. As shown above, independent claim 1 is patentable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that new, dependent claims 14-17 are patentable at least because each of these claims depends from a patentable base claim, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

#### V. Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for immediate allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance are

respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due with this Reply. If any fees are due, however, then please charge such fee deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0540.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
/Maria Taku/  
Randy Lipsitz, Esq.  
Reg. No. 29,189  
Richard L. Moss, Esq.  
Reg. No. 39,782  
Maria Taku  
Reg. No. 63,224  
Attorneys/Agents for Applicants  
KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
(212) 715-9100